UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,740	07/14/2003	Atul K. Puri	07844-594001	7020

21876 7590 05/10/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
BOTTS, MICHAEL K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,740	PURI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 February 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment in Reply to Action of November 21, 2005 [hereinafter "Amendment"], which was filed on February 21, 2006.

2. Claims 1-34 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 14, 17, 31, and 34 being the independent claims.

3. Claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 18, and 34 are currently amended by this Amendment.

4. Figures 2 and 3 of the drawings were objected to. Applicants have submitted replacement drawings addressing the objections. Accordingly, the objections to the drawings is withdrawn.

5. An objection to the specification was made relating to identification of a reference character in the drawings. Applicant's replacement drawings have obviated the objection. Accordingly, the objection to the specification relating to reference character 200 is withdrawn.

6. Claims 1-34 remain rejected.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Wu, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,987,256) [hereinafter "Wu"].

Regarding **independent claim 1, as amended**, Wu teaches:

A method for configuring at least a portion of a document for display in a display environment, the method including:

generating a document color palette for all or a portion of an electronic document, the colors of the document color palette being selected based on colors of a plurality of color containing objects in the document or portion thereof; and

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: "A method of translating a document on a first device for use on a second device, the document being in a standard HTML language, the method comprising: . . . retrieving a plurality of images referenced by the document, generating a color palette for the second platform using the plurality of images and the document . . .."

See also, Wu, dependent claim 10, stating in part: "The method of claim 3 wherein the generating the color palette using the plurality of images and the document comprises: creating a set of colors comprised of all colors used in the plurality of images and all colors used in the document . . ..")

generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a display environment, two or more of the views being based on different color palettes,

the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, the document view including each of the plurality of color containing objects, each color containing object in the document view being represented using the document color palette, and the object view including one of the plurality of color containing objects, the one color containing object in the object view being represented using an object color palette associated with the object view.

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: "translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format, and outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette . . .." See also, Wu, Figure 6 and dependent claims 4 and 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

associating the document color palette with the document or document portion.

(See, Wu, Figure 6, and claims 1, 4, and 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein:

generating the document color palette includes selecting a set of colors based on selection factors and colors in the plurality of color containing objects.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 11.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Wu in view of Dietz teaches:

The method of claim 3, wherein:

the selection factors include at least one of most used colors in the plurality of color containing objects, colors common to the plurality of objects , and a set of substitutable colors.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 10, stating: "The method of claim 1 wherein the supported image formal includes a color palette indexed bitmap format and the translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format comprises: decoding each of the plurality of images into a red-green-blue bitmap format; selecting a color in the color palette for pixels in each of the plurality of images; and outputting a color palette indexed bitmap format for each of the plurality of images.")

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein generating a document color palette includes:

creating a bitmap of the document or portion thereof; and

reducing the colors of the bitmap to generate the document color palette.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 5, wherein:

reducing the number of colors of the bitmap includes selecting a subset of

colors of the bitmap, the subset being selected based on the number of colors . supported in the display environment.

(see, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 6, wherein the bitmap includes N colors and the subset of colors includes M colors, where M<N.

(see, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

rendering the document or document portion in the display environment using the document view.

(See, Wu, claim 1, stating in part: "outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette . . ..")

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein the objects include at least one graphics object and at least one text object, each text object including one or more characters of text.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 12, stating: "The method of claim 1 wherein the translated document includes a plurality of text elements and a plurality of graphics drawing elements.")

Regarding **dependent claim 10, as amended**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein generating a plurality of views of the document includes:

generating an object view of one or more of the plurality of graphics objects in an electronic document, each object view being based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, each object color palette including a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object.

(Wu teaches the generation of a translated document wherein the color palette of the translated document is smaller than that of the original document. It is inherent from the teachings of Wu that more than one document could be generated. See, Wu, Figure 10, specifically teaching translations of a document to "thin" platforms A, B, and C, as shown in figure 10 elements 104, 105,and 106.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 10, further comprising:

generating an object color palette for each of the one or more of the plurality of graphics objects.

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: "retrieving a plurality of images referenced by the document, generating a color palette for the second platform using the plurality of images and the document, . . . translating the plurality of images from

respective formats to the supported image format, and outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette, ..." See also, Wu, dependent claims 4, 7, 10, and 12.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Wu teaches:

> The method of claim 10, further comprising:
>
> storing the object views in the electronic document, each object view being associated with a corresponding document view.

(See, Wu, Figures 12A and 12B, showing saving the data. See also, Wu, col. 9, lines 33-59, teaching saving compiled data to a "non-volatile storage medium" in an off-line environment for later transmission to a "thin platform.")

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Wu teaches:

> *The method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of views includes two different document views, each document view based on a different document color palette.*

(See, Wu, Figure 10, teaching the document being translated for platforms as shown by elements 104-106. Further, it is noted that Wu is directed to tailoring the data to color and rendering capabilities of the receiving platform. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 7, teaching parsing the original data, including color data, to fit the limitations of the target device. It is inherent from the tailoring function that more than one document view will be created.)

Regarding **independent claim 14, as amended**, Wu teaches:

A method for rendering an image in a display environment, the method including:

receiving an electronic document including multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a display environment, a first view for each graphics object being based on a color palette for the graphics object and the second view for each graphics object being based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document; and

rendering the portion of the electronic document according to the second view of each of the plurality of graphics objects.

(See, Wu, col. 19, lines 16-67, teaching and intranet environment and an off-line environment where the originating data is stored and then later translated and saved to a separate files for use by different target users. The server stores both "views" of the document and renders the translated document to the target user.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 14, further comprising:

receiving input selecting a graphics object in the electronic document; and

rendering the selected graphics object according to the first view of the selected graphics object.

(It is noted that the view rendered in this claim is according to the full attributes of the original document. See, Wu, Figure 10, and col. 18, line 49 through 53, showing the connection of a user platform to a network. See also Wu, Figures 10, 11, 12A and 12B, teaching the saving of the object file and sending files to target devices. It is noted that since the invention of Wu processes the original data to a limited form that is appropriate for a more limited target device. It is further noted that if the target device had no limitations, and could accept the original file content, including the original color palette, then the view transferred would be the original or first view.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16**, Wu teaches:

> *The method of claim 14, wherein the portion of the electronic document includes at least one text object, each text object including one or more characters of text and associated color content, the method further comprising:*
>
> *rendering the at least one text object using the document color palette for the portion of the electronic document.*

(See, Wu, dependent claim 7, teaching specifically the generation and rendering of text objects, including color attributes. See also, Wu, dependent claim 12, teaching that the translated document contains text elements.)

Regarding **independent claim 17, as amended**, Wu teaches:

> *A method for configuring at least a portion of a document for display in a display environment, the method including:*

receiving an electronic document including multiple graphics objects; and

generating a display document including multiple views of each of the multiple graphics objects, the multiple views for display in a display environment, each view of the multiple views based on a different color palette and representing a different portion of the electronic document.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 8, teaching specifically the generation and rendering of graphics drawing elements. See also, Wu, dependent claim 12, teaching that the translated document contains graphics elements.)

Regarding **claims 18-28**, claims 18-28 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-13, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 31-33**, claims 31-33 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 14-16, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claim 34**, claim 34 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 17, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments filed February 21, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

9. Arguments regarding rejections of **claims 1-13 and 18-30** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Regarding claims 1 and 18 and their dependent claims, 2-13 and 19-30, respectively, Applicants argue that Wu fails to teach "generating a document color palette ... and generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a display environment, two or more of the views being based on **different color palettes**, the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, ... each color containing object in the document view being represented using the **document color palette**, and ... the one color containing object in the object view being represented using an **object color palette** associated with the object view." See, Amendment, February 21, 2006, pages 11-12, bold in the original.

The Examiner disagrees.

First: It is noted that the limitations of a "document view" and an "object view" were disclosed but not claimed in the original claims. Additionally, the following claim language cited in Applicants' argument was not in the original claim 1, being added by this Amendment: "for display in a display environment," "and an object view, the document view," and "the on color containing object in the object view being represented using an object color palette associated with the object view."

Second: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu does not teach "generating a document color palette."

See, Wu, figures 6 and 7, Tables 1-3, and col. 15, line 21 through col. 16, line 37, teaching creating color palettes and changing color palettes according to the parameters of the target device.

Third: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu does not teach "generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a display environment, two or more of the views being based on **different color palettes**, the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, ... each color containing object in the document view being represented using the **document color palette**, and ... the one color containing object in the object view being represented using an **object color palette** associated with the object view."

See, Wu, figure 10, and see, col. 16, lines 36-37, teaching that the views of a document for display in a display environment are determined by the color palette function, which is used for every page. Therefore, a new color palette appropriate to each page in any of a variety of different devices with displays is taught by Wu.

10. Arguments regarding rejections of **claims 14-16, 17, 31-33, and 34** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Regarding claims 14, 17, 31, and 34 and their dependent claims, 15-16 and 32-33, Applicants argue that Wu fails to teach: "multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a display environment." Further,

Applicants argue that Wu fails to teach: "a first view for each graphics object based on a color palette for the graphics object and a second view for each graphics object based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document." See, Amendment, February 21, 2006, pages 12-13.

The Examiner disagrees.

First: It is noted that the limitations of the following claim language cited in Applicants' argument was not in the original claim 1, being added by this Amendment: "the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a display environment."

Second: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu fails to teach the following limitations: "multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a display environment."

See Wu, col. 19, lines 16-67, specifically lines 22-23, teaching an alternative server and display environment wherein "the server acts as a source of precompiled data sets for thin client platforms." The precompiled data sets for thin client platforms are the different color palettes for rendering in a display environments. See also, Wu, col. 19, lines 30-33, teaching that the server is used for the computing tasks to connect to the various thin display devices. Each of the thin display devices displays a view based on its particular color palette, as saved by the server.

Third: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu fails to teach "a first view for each graphics object based on a color palette for the graphics object and a second view for each graphics object based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document."

See, Wu, col. 2, lines 42-54, teaching a color palette for the source document as the "color palette for the graphics object" and a color palette for the target document as the "color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100